

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. ECF No. 21. Plaintiff, an individual currently incarcerated at the Washington State Penitentiary, 3 is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. The Court did not direct that 4 Defendants be served in this action.

By Order filed October 3, 2024, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Third 6 Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, but without prejudice to Plaintiff filing a new and separate action against newly added Defendants involving allegations that occurred after he filed his initial complaint on April 19, 2024. See ECF No. 19. The Court denied Plaintiff's request 10 for a temporary restraining order. *Id.* Judgment was entered the same day. ECF No. 20.

On October 25, 2024, Plaintiff filed the instant Motion for Reconsideration, asking the Court to reconsider the dismissal of his action. ECF No. 21. For the 14 reasons set forth below, the motion is denied.

11

12

15

16

26

## MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

A motion for reconsideration may be reviewed under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 59(e) (motion to alter or amend a judgment) or Rule 60(b) [18] (relief from judgment). Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc., 5 19 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). "A district court may properly reconsider its 20 decision if it '(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Smith v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist., 727 F.3d 950, 955 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or., 5 F.3d at 1263). "There may also be other, highly unusual, circumstances warranting reconsideration." School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah Cnty., Or., 5 F.3d at 1263.

A motion for reconsideration is not appropriate if used to revisit issues already addressed by the Court or to advance new arguments that could have been 28 raised in prior briefing. American Ironworks & Erectors, Inc. v. N. Am. Const.

Corp., 248 F.3d 892, 898–99 (9th Cir. 2001). Having liberally construed Plaintiff's submissions, the Court finds that he has presented no new facts, information, or newly discovered evidence for the Court to consider in evaluating his request.

School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah Cnty., Or., 5 F.3d at 1263. Plaintiff has not shown the Court committed clear error or that the dismissal of this action was manifestly unjust. There has been no intervening change in controlling law or any other circumstances warranting reconsideration. Id. The failure to follow prison policy does not establish a constitutional violation. See Cousins v. Lockyer, 568 F.3d 1063, 1070 (9th Cir. 2009).

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 21, is DENIED.
- 2. The Court certifies that any appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.
  - 3. The file shall remain CLOSED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to enter this Order and provide a copy to Plaintiff.

DATED this 5th day of December 2024.



Stanley A. Bastian Chief United States District Judge

28

26

27